REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on September 27, 2005. Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-28 are currently pending in this application, with claims 8 and 18 being independent.

No new matter has been added.

Specification objection

Page 2 of the Office Action includes an objection to the specification.

In response, while not conceding the propriety of this objection and in order to advance the prosecution of the above-identified application, the specification has been amended.

Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of the claims

Page 2 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 1-7 under 37 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Page 2 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,837,962 to Overbeck.

Page 2 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claims 3 and 6(3) under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 35-807024 to Hirayama et al. (Hirayama).

Page 3 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Overbeck.

Pages 3-4 of the Office Action includes a rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Overbeck or Hirayama.

In response, while not conceding the propriety of this rejection and in order to advance the prosecution of the above-identified application, claims 1-7 have been canceled rendering the rejection of these claims as moot.

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Newly added claims

Referring to Figure 3 of the specification as originally filed, claim 8 is drawn to a marking method comprising the steps of:

emitting a laser beam (1);

deflecting said emitted laser beam (1) in accordance with a frequency of an X applied electrical signal (14) and a frequency of a Y applied electrical signal (15);

separating said deflected laser beam (6) into a plurality of laser beams;

scanning a first of said plurality of laser beams onto a substrate (10); and

scanning a second of said plurality of laser beams onto said substrate (10).

Again referring to Figure 3 of the specification as originally filed, claim 18 is drawn to a marking apparatus that includes the features of:

a laser oscillator mechanism (1) adapted to emit a laser beam (2);

an acoustic deflector mechanism (3, 5) adapted to deflect said emitted laser beam (2) in accordance with a frequency of an X applied electrical signal (14) and a frequency of a Y applied electrical signal (15) (Specification at Figure 4, paragraphs [0021], [0022], and [0026]);

a separator mechanism adapted to separate said deflected laser beam (6) into a plurality of laser beams (Specification at Figure 3, paragraph [0026]);

a first galvanometer scanner mechanism (7, 8) adapted to scan a first of said plurality of laser beams onto a substrate (10) (Specification at Figure 3); and

a second galvanometer scanner mechanism (7, 8) adapted to scan a second of said plurality of laser beams onto said substrate (10) (Specification at Figure 3).

Overbeck - Overbeck arguably teaches the presence of a two-dimensional acousto-optic deflector 5, a first galvo 7, and a second galvo 9 (Overbeck at Figure 1). Overbeck arguably teaches a two-dimensional acousto-optic deflector 5 implemented as two one-dimensional acousto-optic deflectors 103 and 108 (Overbeck at Figure 3, column 5, lines 18-21). Overbeck arguably teaches the use of a digital to analog converter (DAC) 50 that controls the frequency of the voltage controlled oscillator (VCO) 51 (Overbeck at Figure 6, column 12, lines 30-31). Moreover, Overbeck arguably teaches an RF Power amplifier 53 linked to a one-dimensional acousto-optic deflector 103, along with an RF Power amplifier 61 linked to a one-dimensional acousto-optic deflector 108 (Overbeck at Figure 6).

Nevertheless, Overbeck fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a separator mechanism adapted to separate a laser beam from two-dimensional acousto-optic deflector 5 into a plurality of laser beams (Overbeck at Figure 1).

In addition, Overbeck arguably teaches a first galvanometer scanner mechanism 6, 7, 8, 9 adapted to scan a laser beam onto a workpiece 11 (Overbeck at Figure 1).

Yet, Overbeck fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a second galvanometer scanner mechanism that adapted to scan a second of a plurality of laser beams onto the workpiece 11.

Hirayama - Without the benefit of a full translation, Figure 1 of Hirayama appears to teach an apparatus that includes a polarizing element 4 and galvanometer mirrors 6 and 9.

However, Figure 1 of Hirayama appears to *fail* in showing the polarizing element 4 as being adapted to produce a deflected laser beam, and appears to *fail* in showing beam 12 being separated into a plurality of laser beams.

Figure 1 of Hirayama also appears to *fail* in showing the galvanometer mirrors 6 and 9 as being adapted to scan the beam 12 onto a substrate along with a second galvanometer scanner mechanism adapted to scan a second of a plurality of laser beams onto the substrate.

Also without the benefit of a full translation, Figure 4 of Hirayama appears to teach an apparatus that includes a galvanometer mirror 51.

However, Figure 4 of Hirayama appears to *fail* in showing the galvanometer mirror 51 as being adapted to scan a beam onto a substrate along with a second galvanometer scanner mechanism adapted to scan a second of a plurality of laser beams onto the substrate.

Allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

Dated: December 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By________________________
David T. Nikaido
Registration No.: 22,663
Brian K. Dutton
Registration No.: 47,255
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 955-3750
Attorneys for Applicant